	K87PGREC
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
2	X
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
4	v. 17 CR 630-5 (ER) Telephone Conference
5	KARL SEBASTIAN GREENWOOD,
6	Defendant.
7	x
8	New York, N.Y. August 7, 2020 9:06 a.m.
10	Before:
11	HON. EDGARDO RAMOS,
12	
	District Judge
13	APPEARANCES VIA TELEPHONE
14 15	AUDREY STRAUSS, Acting United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York
16 17	NICHOLAS FOLLY CHRISTOPHER J. DIMASE Assistant United States Attorneys
18	
	BARKET EPSTEIN KEARON ALDEA & LO TURCO, LLP Attorneys for Defendant
19	BY: BRUCE A. BARKET ALEXANDER R. KLEIN
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 (The Court and all parties appearing telephonically) THE COURT: Good morning, everyone. This is Judge 2 3 Ramos. 4 Jazmine, please call the case. 5 (Case called) 6 MR. FOLLY: Good morning, your Honor. This is 7 Nicholas Folly on behalf of the government. I'm also joined by 8 AUSA Christopher Dimase. 9 THE COURT: Good morning. 10 MR. BARKET: Good morning, your Honor. This is Bruce 11 Barket for Mr. Greenwood. Joining me, as his counsel, is 12 Alexander Klein, and I believe Mr. Greenwood is on the call as 13 well. 14 THE COURT: Good morning. 15 Mr. Greenwood, can you confirm that you're on the

call?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, good morning. This is Mr. Greenwood on the phone. Thank you.

THE COURT: Good morning to you.

This matter is on for a status conference, but for the record, I note that it is being conducted remotely and by telephone as a result of the pandemic. We are being assisted by a court reporter; so when you speak, please do state your name and speak slowly and clearly so we can all understand you and particularly the court reporter.

Before we get going, Mr. Greenwood, I just want to confirm with you that you understand that you have a right to be present in court for this proceeding. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And have you confirmed or have you discussed with your lawyer your right to be present for this proceeding?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have.

THE COURT: And do you waive your right to be present for this proceeding?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: And, Mr. Barket, will you confirm for me that you have discussed this issue with your client and that he does waive his right to be present for this proceeding?

MR. BARKET: This is Bruce Barket. Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: Very well.

Mr. Folly or Mr. Dimase, tell me where we are.

MR. FOLLY: Yes, good morning, your Honor. This is
Nicholas Folly. Since the parties last appeared, there has
been some turnover with the defendant's representation in this
case. He has retained new counsel a number of times and most
recently retained new counsel at the end of May of this year.

His new counsel has only had a couple of months on the case at this point, and we have produced a subset of discovery

to Mr. Barket and Mr. Klein. We have had some discussions with defense counsel, both current and former, about a potential pretrial resolution of this case. However, in light of some of the current circumstances, particularly with respect to attorney visits, it has simply not been a sufficient amount of time for Mr. Barket and Mr. Klein to fully discuss this case with Mr. Greenwood and adequately review the discovery that they have and discuss his options at this stage.

As we understand it, he is evaluating whether to move forward with this case in a sort of potential trial posture or to move forward with some sort of pretrial resolution of the case.

From the government's perspective, and we've discussed this a little bit with defense counsel, at this stage, I believe it would make sense to hold off on setting any deadlines for motion practice or the completion of discovery, at least for now, and to come back for another conference within the next month or two to revisit the status of the case and proceed from there at that time.

THE COURT: Very well. Mr. Barket?

MR. BARKET: This is Bruce Barket. I agree with the government in this instance.

I'll add that the method by which we are able to communicate with our client, while we appreciate all the work that's being done by various parties, including apparently the

federal public defenders in coordinating this, it is woefully inadequate, especially to confer with somebody on a case as complex like this.

We get an about an hour once every ten days or so, sometimes a little bit longer. This week, and I don't know why but I certainly do appreciate it, we were able to get Wednesday for an hour and a half and yesterday for an hour and a half; so we got a total of 180 minutes over two days and made some real progress. But this has been painstakingly slow.

If we had the ability to visit our client, i.e. going to the jail, like the guards do every day, we would spend hours with him over a very short amount of time to get up to speed on this. It's a \$15 billion alleged scheme, international crypto-currency with a huge amount of discovery and a great deal of information available, frankly, on the internet about One Coin, all which needs to be reviewed by us and then discussed with our client, who the government has alleged is one of the key participants in the alleged fraud.

So I certainly agree that we need more time before we can move forward with any deadlines, but I did want to note that the way the system is currently set up, which is prohibiting us from seeing our client at the facility and limiting us to having to ask for video conferences, which usually take about ten days to set up, is really not sufficient and it's not, I don't think, sustainable over the course of --

for very much longer. It's been this way since May and, obviously, for several months before that although we weren't representing Mr. Greenwood at that time.

THE COURT: Can I ask you, Mr. Barket, where is Mr. Greenwood being held?

MR. BARKET: At MCC, your Honor.

THE COURT: In Manhattan?

MR. BARKET: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, I certainly appreciate not only the complexity of this case but the obstacles that you have in communicating with your client as a result of the pandemic. I mean, I will say this. The efforts that are being undertaken by the BOP, you know, have served to maintain a level of safety that has resulted in both the MCC and the MDC having rather good results in terms of the spread of the pandemic or the Covid.

So it's a difficult situation, I understand, and, you know, I will do whatever I can to facilitate your ability to communicate with your lawyer. But these are difficult times, unfortunately.

So we should come back in about two months, Mr. Folly?

MR. FOLLY: Yes, your Honor. That would make sense to the government.

THE COURT: Mr. Barket?

MR. BARKET: (Indiscernible)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Okay. Mr. Barket, you were breaking up. THE COURT: I understood you to say you have no objection to that, correct? MR. BARKET: That's correct, Judge. THE COURT: Okay. So, Ms. Rivera, will you give us a time in early October? THE DEPUTY CLERK: Yes. October 5 at 11:00 a.m. THE COURT: Okay. In the meantime, Mr. Barket, have you received all of the discovery in this case? MR. BARKET: Excuse me. I've received the entire file from prior counsel and some additional discovery from the government. I'm assuming that's all but --THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Folly, can you confirm that all of the discovery that the government has has been turned over to Mr. Barket? MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, at this stage, we have not turned over all of the discovery primarily because of the ongoing discussions about a pretrial resolution. We have focused on providing to defense counsel what we believe is some of the most pertinent and inculpatory portions of that discovery, including some of the defendant's e-mails and other such communications that demonstrate his knowledge and participation in this fraud scheme, as well as his conception from the very beginning of the fraud scheme. We would be happy to have a discussion with defense

counsel and then come back to the Court with a proposed

discovery schedule, if that makes sense with defense counsel as well.

THE COURT: Mr. Barket?

MR. BARKET: That is fine with us. Frankly, I mean, we've not gotten very far in going through the discovery we have because of the difficulties in consulting with my client. That isn't say we haven't had the ability to read it.

Obviously, we have.

But the second step, which is fairly important, to discuss it and go over it in detail with Mr. Greenwood is -- we're a long way from completing what we have.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, I would encourage you, the parties, to have discussions about what has not been turned over and what Mr. Barket may determine to be useful for his discussions with Mr. Greenwood.

 $\label{eq:second-seco$

MR. FOLLY: Your Honor, the government would move for the exclusion of time in the interests of justice from today through October 5th so that defense counsel has sufficient time to continue reviewing discovery, and also so that the parties can continue to discuss a pretrial resolution in this case.

THE COURT: Mr. Barket?

MR. BARKET: I agree, Judge. We would not object to the exclusion of time.

THE COURT: Very well. I will exclude the time 1 2 between now and October 5 under the Speedy Trial Act. I find 3 that Mr. Greenwood's interests in continuing his discussions with Mr. Barket and his other lawyers and reviewing the 4 5 discovery and discussing a pretrial disposition outweigh the 6 interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy and 7 public trial; so that time will be excluded. 8 Is there anything else that you wanted to raise, 9 Mr. Barket? 10 MR. BARKET: No. Thank you, your Honor. 11 THE COURT: Mr. Folly? 12 MR. FOLLY: No, your Honor. 13 THE COURT: In that event, we are adjourned. 14 Everyone, please stay well. 15 MR. BARKET: You too. MR. FOLLY: Thank you, Judge. 16 17 (Adjourned) 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25